

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-7, 10, 13 and 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor et al (EP 0354663). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed towards a device and method for supplying low viscosity processing solution to a processing apparatus. A fixed amount of solution is metered out of the delivery unit as required. The delivery unit comprises a storage container and a piston incorporated therein. Means for activation of the piston is also included. The container acts as both the storage container and as part of the metering system for delivering an accurate volume of solution. It is not intended that the entire contents of the container be emptied in one go. This would not be a metering system. The amount of solution dispensed from the container can be very accurately varied and controlled by changing the displacement of the piston. This is explicitly stated on page 5, lines 28 to 30 of the specification. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify this issue.

Taylor discloses a system for introducing a flowable additive from a syringe into a container of paint or such like. The entire contents of the syringe are emptied into the container in one go. There is no suggestion that the additive should be metered into the container. The system is concerned with a one shot device. The system addresses the problem of spillage between the syringe and the container. The design of the syringe ensures accurate location relative to the container and minimizes the chance of movement during delivery of the additive. The syringe can only be used once since after the addition of the additive into the container the piston rod and chamber are detached and removed, see column 7, lines 15 to 18. The entire contents must therefore be emptied into the container.

Taylor does not disclose a delivery unit for supplying low viscosity processing solution to a processing apparatus as asserted by the Examiner. Taylor is concerned with paint additives which are usually high viscosity. High viscosity solutions are very difficult to meter and, as stated above, the device disclosed in Taylor does not attempt to meter the additive. The excerpt referred to by the Examiner, i.e., col. 6, ll. 49-56, merely refers to the fact that the container has a piston which is used to dispel the additive. No means for activation of the piston "...such that a fixed amount of solution is delivered...each time the piston is activated." as required by the claims is shown or suggested. There is no "each

time” for the piston disclosed in Taylor. The piston is only activated once and all contents of the syringe are delivered to the container. The device disclosed in Taylor cannot perform the method as claimed as it cannot vary the amount of additive delivered.

For the reasons set out above claims 1 and 10 of the present application should be allowed over Taylor. Claims 6-7 and 13 and 20-21 are dependent on claims 1 and 10 respectively. They therefore include all the features of claims 1 and 10. For the same reasons as set out above claims 6-7, 13 and 20-21 of the present invention should be allowed.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al in view of Hoffman et al. (US 4,522,316). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hoffman discloses a container for plastics substances. The container incorporates a plastic seal provided behind the piston portion of the container. Claim 11 is dependent on claim 10 and thus includes all the features of claim 10. A combination of Taylor and Hoffman would not result in the invention as claimed in claim 11. Neither Taylor nor Hoffman disclose or suggest means for activation of the piston such that a variable fixed amount of solution is delivered. For the reasons set out above claim 11 of the present application should be allowed over Taylor in view of Hoffman.

Claims 2-3, 5, 9, 14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al in view of Peng (US 5,615,807). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Peng discloses a caulking gun having a shaft driven forwardly in response to reciprocal operation of the shaft by a handle mechanism. The gun is used for high viscosity media which requires some force to leave the dispenser. The aim of the device is to deliver a substantially continuous stream of media during multiple cycles of the handle mechanism. There is no disclosure nor suggestion of accurate metering of delivery of the media.

Claims 2-3, 5 and 9 and 14 and 16 are dependent on claims 1 and 10 respectively and thus include all the features of claims 1 and 10. A combination of Taylor and Peng would not result in the invention as claimed in claims 2-3, 5, 9, 14 and 16. Neither Taylor nor Peng disclose or suggest means for activation of the piston such that a variable fixed amount of solution is delivered.

For the reasons set out above claims 2-3, 5, 9, 14 and 16 of the present application should be allowed over Taylor in view of Peng.

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al in view of Koehler et al (US 5,538,161). Claim 19 has been cancelled.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims in their present form are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Paul Benull", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 27,370

Frank Pincelli/jrk
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2768
Facsimile: 585-477-4646